

17258

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 3, 1966

"Whereas numerous bread price increases are being attributed entirely to higher farm prices for wheat, and

"Whereas some newspaper accounts indicate retail price increases of as much as 5 times price increases to farmers have been attributed entirely to the increase in farm return; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is requested to make a survey through the field offices of his Department of the amount of retail milk price increases since April 1 in towns and cities of the Nation, their relationship to increases in farm price support in each instance, and the extent to which the public was clearly advised, or misinformed, as to the reason for such increase; and that the Secretary similarly survey bread price increases and their relationship to farm returns for wheat, reporting to this Committee as early as possible."

THE "CREDIBILITY GAP" WIDENS IN OUR WAR IN VIETNAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it should not be news to my colleagues in the Senate and the House that the American people are not getting the facts about what is going on in Vietnam. Indeed, they have never gotten the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about our involvement in southeast Asia.

Actually, the whole basis alleged for our military intervention is false. It is not true, as the official pronouncements have stated again and again, that we were invited in by a friendly government to help it repel aggression. The official record, found in the State Department's publication: "Why Vietnam," issued August 20, 1965, with the foreword by President Lyndon B. Johnson, is bare of any such commitment. It is not found in the crucial letter of President Eisenhower to President Diem of October 1, 1954, in which President Eisenhower proffered aid but coupled his offer with conditions of reform and good performance which were never carried out. The only request for aid by Diem had been one to assist in the transportation of several hundred thousand North Vietnamese to South Vietnam.

The lack of such a request by Diem—to help repel aggression—and the evidence that it was we, the United States, who asked ourselves in, is further confirmed in the White House statement of November 3, 1954, which states that President Eisenhower had instructed Gen. J. Lawton Collins, as his special representative, to explore with President Diem and his government how to help them with their critical problems and to supplement measures adopted by the Vietnamese themselves. The initiative for intervention came from the United States. At no time under President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, and not until after the inception of the Johnson administration, were any U.S. troops sent into combat. Previous to 1964, they had only been military advisers. Therefore, the official allegations repeatedly made that three Presidents have made this commitment, and that it has thereby become a national pledge, are without foundation. The fact is, we asked ourselves in and, by our subsequent actions, we have become the aggressors.

Equally unfounded is the subsequently dredged up assertion that the SEATO Treaty, in article 4, justifies our military intervention. That likewise is a deception. This article of the SEATO Treaty makes clear that in the case of aggression all the parties to the treaty shall consult and come to a conclusion by unanimous agreement. There never was any consultation, and, of course, there was, and could be, no unanimous agreement because at least two of the signers of the SEATO Treaty—France and Pakistan—are completely out of sympathy with our attitude and actions in southeast Asia.

The stark and unpalatable fact, which the official propaganda has never been willing to face, is that we went half way around the world to inject ourselves into a civil war and, in doing so, violated every pertinent treaty commitment—the United Nations Charter, the SEATO Treaty—which, in article 1, refers to the United Nations requirement not to resort to force but only to peaceful means, as further enumerated in article 33—and we likewise violated the unilateral commitment made for the United States by Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith that we would respect the Geneva agreements and its pledge of all-Vietnam elections. All these we violated, and treaties, under our Constitution, are of the highest class of commitments.

We might add that there was a further commitment which the American people understood, or thought they understood, that President Johnson made in his campaign not to follow the Goldwater policies, but to find a peaceable solution to our presence in Vietnam, which, at the time of his campaign, had not escalated into sending our troops into combat.

President Johnson, in the course of his campaign, said:

There are those who say I ought to go North and drop bombs to wipe out the supply lines. . . . But we don't want to get tied down in a land war in Asia.

And President Johnson also said:

We are not about to send American boys nine or ten thousand miles away from home to do what Asian boys should be doing for themselves.

When he made these statements in the fall of 1964, he did make a commitment to the American people.

That commitment has been totally breached. We are going further and further north. We are getting bogged down in a land war. And we are sending more and more American boys 9,000 or 10,000 miles away from home.

No wonder there is a "credibility gap." It is ever widening.

The allegation that we are fighting aggression and that North Vietnam—Hanoi—is the aggressor, is also a distortion of the truth. There has been infiltration from the North, but it followed U.S. violation of our agreements and was far less in quantity than ours. Moreover, we are expected to be the law-abiding, treaty-respecting nation.

So much for the past, with its awesome present and future consequences.

We now find four veteran reporters, newspaper men of integrity and repute, now in Vietnam, assailing the United

States' news policies in Saigon. They are Dean Erelis, of the National Broadcasting Co.; Malcolm Browne, formerly of the Associated Press and a Pulitzer Prize winner, who has been in Vietnam for years; Charles Mohr, of the New York Times, likewise there for considerable time; and Jack Foisi, a star correspondent for the Los Angeles Times, also an old Asia hand.

In an article published in the New York Times under a three-column headline reading: "Four Reporters Assail U.S. News Policies in Saigon," Mr. Browne points out that the Pentagon's news policies prevent reporters from getting first-hand information about military activity in Laos and Thailand. "As far as the command is concerned publicly," Mr. Browne averred, "Laos doesn't exist. Neither does Thailand." Surely, the American people are entitled to know of our steady widening of the war and that American troops are operating outside of South and North Vietnam in both of these other countries.

Mr. Browne also referred to Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, as "one of the great practitioners of the 'art' of news management."

I ask unanimous consent that the news article from the New York Times of August 2, 1966, headed: "Four Reporters Assail U.S. News Policies in Saigon," be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. A more detailed commentary on Assistant Secretary Sylvester and his performance is published in the August issue of the Progressive magazine, published at Madison, Wis. In it is an account about Mr. Sylvester which appeared in Dateline 1966, a publication of the Overseas Press Club, which revealed that Sylvester made no secret of the fact that he expected American newsmen to disseminate only information "that made the United States look good."

At this point, a network television correspondent said:

Surely, Arthur, you don't expect the American press to be the handmaidens of government?

Sylvester, he recalled, replied:
That's exactly what I expect.

That is what an official in a totalitarian country would and could expect. It is shocking to hear that from an American official.

Considering the widening "credibility gap," which is a euphemism for what actually goes on—namely, that the American people are being misled by their government officials—when this matter was brought up, Sylvester replied:

Look, if you think any American official is going to tell you the truth, then you're stupid. Did you hear that—stupid?

There is much else in this revealing résumé as to the lack of concern on the part of some Pentagon officials, and especially Assistant Secretary Sylvester, about getting the truth to the American people; and I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "The 'Bull Session,'" from the August issue of the Pro-

August 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17257

position at that time to make any contract concessions.

Mr. NELSON. I do not interpret the question or the answer in that way. As I am sure the Senator will agree in retrospect, Mr. Siemiller was giving an honest and accurate answer. Because the fact of the matter is that the contract was rejected by a large margin.

I think his guess is correct, that they would not go back to work without the contract settled, because of course they would lose their bargaining position, then, to go back and bargain while working, and then go out on another strike—

Mr. PROUTY. They would not lose their bargaining position, because they would retain the right to strike again at any time, a right which they shall lose by our passing a resolution regardless of its final form.

Mr. NELSON. Yes, but to have two strikes in a row is something I do not believe that the union membership or leaders would want to get engaged in.

But my point here is, I think there may well be a time when Congress should act. But as of last Wednesday—and the distinguished Senator from Vermont was on the committee, and made a fine contribution to the discussion and the questioning at all stages—I think the Senator will agree we thought there was hardly any chance; and when I was urging that we wait until Friday for a reply from the Secretary, many people there thought the chances were almost nil, and that perhaps we ought to send out a bill immediately. I, too, felt they were almost nil; but bam, on Friday they reached an agreement.

I say that as of this moment, today, there is a better chance of their getting back together and negotiating the relatively small points which I think now separate the membership's willingness to accept and the employers' position; and if in fact they could in the next 3, 4, or 5 days reach an agreement that was reasonable and not too costly, one that could be met, I think that would be a much better solution, to delay action for these 4 or 5 days, than for Congress to move in, for the first time in 40 years, in this kind of a situation.

Mr. PROUTY. If we had any assurance that would take place, I am sure we would all agree. However, I cannot see it in the same light as the Senator, particularly in view of the Secretary of Labor's testimony on Monday to the effect that he did not anticipate a voluntary settlement in the immediate future.

Mr. NELSON. As the Senator knows, the Secretary of Labor could give us no assurance on last Wednesday, and yet dramatically they reached an agreement. If they can do it once, they can do it again.

Mr. PROUTY. Last Wednesday, the Secretary asked us to delay reporting a bill in order to permit certain avenues to be explored. Day before yesterday, however, he testified that these avenues had been exhausted and that he was no longer hopeful of an early settlement. The agreement reached Friday also troubles me, or rather, the failure of the union membership to ratify its terms troubles

me. I believe the union's national negotiating committee was under extreme governmental pressure to settle, and that it was also under pressure to reach an agreement from a public relations standpoint.

However, when the officers and leaders of most of the IAM locals involved recommended to their respective memberships that the contract terms be rejected, I do not think that many of us were surprised at the outcome of the vote. This might be a case where the union's national leaders acted responsibly, but one where the leaders of the various local unions did not. I think the ratification vote might have shown quite a different result if the local leaders had urged approval of the new contract.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

INVESTIGATION OF PRICE INCREASES ON MILK, BREAD, AND OTHER COMMODITIES

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am happy to announce to the Senate that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this morning unanimously approved a resolution which I presented to the committee.

This resolution would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake an immediate investigation and survey of price increases for milk, bread, and other commodities.

The purpose of the investigation is to provide the committee and the Congress and the American people with information that will give us an understanding of what is behind sharp food price increases, particularly the price increases for bread and milk, that have taken place in recent days.

There has been an unfortunate effort on the part of some industry spokesmen to attribute increases of as much as 3 cents a quart in the price of milk entirely to the milk producers, because of modest increases in farm price supports on April 1, and again on July 1.

There has also been an implication that increases of as much as 2 cents a loaf in the price of bread can be explained entirely by modest advances in wheat prices.

I think that investigation will demonstrate very quickly that the farmer's return represents a very small part of the increase in milk and bread prices.

The purpose of the investigation which our committee has instructed the Secretary to undertake immediately is not to make anyone a scapegoat, but simply to demonstrate the facts, and to show that when there is an increase of 2 cents on a loaf of bread or 3 cents on a quart of milk—as we have had in a number of market areas around the country—many factors go into such an increase other than the amount the farmer receives. The farmers' share is actually a minor part of the total.

The Metropolitan Milk Institute of New York wired me this morning that the figures on milk price increases in a New York Times story of last Friday were in error. It may very well be that

there is some error or conflict in various statistics that have been cited. If this is true, then it further points up the need for a reliable and fully publicized investigation, and statement of the true facts by the Department of Agriculture.

When the investigation is completed—and I hope that it will begin immediately and be completed within the next 2 or 3 weeks—the Secretary will then report his information to our committee. At that time, if hearings seem to be in order, I hope our committee will take that into consideration.

I do think that this investigation is in the interest of not only farm producers, but also consumers. Consumers have a right to know the facts and to understand what is behind these very marked increases in food prices which have occurred during the last few weeks. I know that farmers are not to blame and I am determined that this be demonstrated to the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my resolution as unanimously approved by the committee this morning be printed at this point in the RECORD along with a press statement which I released this noon.

There being no objection, the statement and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE APPROVES McGOVERN FOOD PRICE RESOLUTION

The Senate Agriculture Committee today unanimously approved a resolution proposed by Senator GEORGE McGOVERN directing the Department of Agriculture to survey and report to the Committee on the extent to which farmers are being improperly blamed for milk, bread and other food price increases.

The resolution directs the Department to make a survey, community-by-community, of the amount of farm price increases, the amount of consumer price increases, and the extent to which increases in excess of the farm return were blamed on increased farm prices.

In presenting the resolution, McGOVERN read newspaper articles which he said falsely blamed farmers for milk price increases that were actually double and triple what the farmers get. "Bread prices have been raised in many places several times more than is justified by increases in wheat prices," he said.

"The investigation I have requested as approved by the Committee is not an effort to make a scapegoat of anyone," Senator McGOVERN said.

"It is an effort to be sure that consumers clearly understand that farm prices are only a minor factor in most of the current round of food price increases."

The resolution, which will go directly from the Committee to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, asks him to report back to the Committee on the price increases as early as possible. The Committee will then consider the need for hearings.

The Committee agreed to amend the resolution to cover several food commodities, including butter, cheese and eggs, and increases in meat costs resulting from specification buying.

The resolution approved by the Committee, as originally submitted by Senator McGOVERN, follows:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas members of the Senate Agriculture Committee are receiving protests against milk price support increases indicating public misunderstanding of the extent of April 1 and July 1 rises in supports to farmers, and,

August 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17259

gressive, be printed also at the conclusion of my remarks.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

FOUR REPORTERS ASSAIL U.S. NEWS POLICIES
IN SAIGON—ON TV, THEY SAY BRIEFINGS BY
MILITARY ARE OFTEN LATE, INACCURATE, AND
COLORLESS

Defense Department information policies and press briefings in Vietnam were sharply criticized by four American correspondents there in a television program last night.

The correspondents, whose remarks were taped in Saigon, said briefings by United States military spokesmen were often colorless, late and inaccurate. The daily briefings are called "The 5 o'clock follies" by many correspondents, Dean Breis of the National Broadcasting Company said.

Malcolm Browne, a former Associated Press reporter and a Pulitzer Prize-winner now doing free lance work in Vietnam, said on the National Educational Television program on WNED that the briefing officers often lie.

Charles Mohr, a New York Times correspondent, said the information officers in Saigon were "more interested in policy than facts" and in "the effect of a story—rather than its accuracy."

A SANITARY WAR

He said the Administration was reluctant for correspondents to write about napalm or antipersonnel bombs. "They want to make it a sanitary war," he said.

Mr. Browne criticized the Pentagon's news policies, which, he said prevented reporters from getting first-hand information about American military activity in Laos and Thailand. "As far as the command is concerned publicly," said the writer, "Laos doesn't exist. Neither does Thailand."

He said Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, was "one of the great practitioners" of the "art" of news management.

He said the Administration, and "particularly Secretary [of Defense Robert S.] McNamara, have deliberately misled American public opinion." An example of this, he said, is "the continual harping on the North Vietnamese aggression." Mr. Browne said the war in Vietnam was basically a civil war. The three other correspondents agreed.

Jack Folsom, a reporter for The Los Angeles Times, said he would prefer "formal censorship" to news management "that squashes information at the roots."

There was sympathy for the briefing officers, though, Mr. Mohr said they often "give a distorted picture, not out of either bad motive or viciousness, but simply because they themselves don't have a clear idea of what happened."

The correspondents agreed with a statement by Mr. Breis that no one could cover the war adequately from Saigon. "You've got to go out there," he said.

EXHIBIT 2

THE "BULL SESSION"

As Assistant Secretary for Public Defense, Arthur Sylvester, a former newspaperman, is charged with the top responsibility for the official release of war news from Vietnam. This most sensitive task demands, among other qualities, an appreciation of the people's right to know a great deal more than they now do about the war they are paying for with their taxes and the lives of their sons.

If an account written by Morley Safer, a respected Columbia Broadcasting System newsmen in Vietnam, is essentially correct—Sylvester has attacked it without effectively

refuting it—then the Assistant Secretary holds views on the handling of war news that should horrify the press and public, and justify his removal by President Johnson.

Safer's account, which appeared in *Date-line 1966*, a publication of the Overseas Press Club, revealed that in July, 1965, a meeting was held in Saigon between Sylvester and a group of American newsmen to discuss some of the problems involved in covering the war. Sylvester, wrote Safer afterwards, "seemed anxious to take a stand to say something that would jar us. He did."

The first jolt, as Safer told the story, came when Sylvester said, "I can't understand how you fellows can write what you do while American boys are dying out here." Then he went on, as Safer described it, "to the effect that American correspondents had a patriotic duty to disseminate only information that made the United States look good."

A network television correspondent said, "Surely, Arthur, you don't expect the American can press to be the handmaidens of government?" Sylvester, Safer recalled, replied, "That's exactly what I expect."

When the problems of the credibility of American officials was brought up, Sylvester responded: "Look, if you think any American official is going to tell you the truth, then you're stupid. Did you hear that—stupid?"

One of the newsmen suggested that Sylvester "was being deliberately provocative." The Assistant Secretary, according to Safer, replied: "Look, I don't even have to talk to you people. I know how to deal with you through your editors and publishers back in the States."

Safer's account of what immediately followed this threat is astounding: "At this point, the Hon. Arthur Sylvester put his thumbs in his ears, bulged his eyes, stuck out his tongue, and wiggled his fingers."

At one point Sylvester asked: "Do you guys want to be spoon-fed? Why don't you get out and cover the war?" The effect, as described by Safer: "It was a jarring and insulting remark. Most of the people in that room had spent as much time on actual operations as most GIs. Two television correspondents walked out, saying they had enough. A few minutes later, two more correspondents left."

If Sylvester made a single one of the remarks attributed to him he merits dismissal. When the Overseas Press Club published the Safer article, Representative DURWARD G. HALL, Missouri Republican, entered it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and told the House that "if Mr. Safer's reporting of this meeting is accurate—and based on my own experience I have no doubt that it is—then Mr. Sylvester should either resign, or be fired."

Sylvester later wrote to Representative HALL, attaching a copy of his correspondence with Victor Riesel, president of the Overseas Press Club. The Congressman inserted Sylvester's response in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—where it has been greeted with the same press silence that was accorded the original incident for a whole year.

In his letter to Riesel, the Assistant Secretary referred to Safer's account as a "gem of misrepresentation," and charged him with distortions and "self-created quotations attributed to me." Sylvester said that Safer was correct on only one point—that in opening the session Barry Zorthian, minister-counselor of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, said it was not the usual briefing for information, but a "bull session." Otherwise, wrote Sylvester, "his (Safer's) recollection of the evening was 'bull.'" He made specific denials of only one of the comments attributed to him by Safer, and then concluded with an attack on Safer's reputation as a newsmen.

The indifference of Congress and the press to this incident is shockingly callous. If

Safer still stands by his story, as we understand he does, his description of the official Pentagon position on the handling of news in Vietnam, especially the Sylvester notion that the people are entitled to only that news which makes the United States look good, should be the subject of a comprehensive Congressional investigation—and the sooner the better.

THE AIRLINE LABOR DISPUTE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 186) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute currently existing between certain air carriers and certain of their employees, and for other purposes.

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, the majority leader has in mind suggesting a unanimous-consent agreement to apply to the Lausche amendment only. I think that perhaps the staff on both sides of the aisle will wish to notify Senators, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

MR. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. CLARK. I yield.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

MR. CLARK. I withhold it.

MR. KUCHEL. My understanding is that the limitation would go into effect about half an hour from now.

MR. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

MR. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I have a brief statement of 3 or 4 minutes.

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the approval of the floor manager of the bill, the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and also the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at 1:30, there be an hour of debate on the Lausche amendment, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Pennsylvania [MR. CLARK] for 30 minutes, and the other 30 minutes by the Senator from Ohio [MR. LAUSCHE].

MR. KUCHEL. Reserving the right to object—and I approve it—I have been informed by a staff member that one Senator here said he had some objections.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw the request.

MR. KUCHEL. For 2 minutes; then the Senator will be here.

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida.

MR. SMATHERS. Mr. President, with the airline strike now in its 27th day, I

17260

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 3, 1966

am prepared to support vigorously and vote for any equitable measure that will assure prompt restoration of air service for the benefit of the general public.

There is no further need to recite statistics to demonstrate how serious an effect this impasse between labor and management has had on the American economy. We have heard numerous statements in this Chamber that have recounted the hardships suffered by everyone from the stranded tourist to the merchant who has watched his business dwindle away to a trickle.

There is strong evidence that, if allowed to drag on much longer, this walkout could set off a general economic downturn that would be highly resistant to any corrective action.

I am convinced that not more than one or two Senators doubt the words of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in Senate Joint Resolution 186, that "emergency measures are essential to the settlement of this dispute and to the security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers."

I am convinced that nearly every Senator is aware of the urgent necessity for steps to protect the welfare of the general public.

Yet, I am also convinced that many Senators are reluctant—for whatever reason—to associate themselves with those steps.

It is ironic that some of these Members of Congress who frequently proclaim the abject surrender of the legislative branch of this Government to the executive branch are the ones who are now hesitant to move in this field. They chide the President and other members of his administration for attempting to bypass or ignore the Congress. In their flights of wrath, they proclaim that Congress has become an "errand boy" to the President—that his wish is our command.

But now, faced with a road heavily mined with political explosives, they would turn back and have the President lead the way for them.

Mr. President, Congress has clear authority in this matter. This is our road to walk, and article 1, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution is our guide. It provides that Congress has the power to regulate interstate commerce.

Should we fail to assume our responsibility, should we attempt to shunt it to the President, Congress would be gravely imperiling the concept of separate and co-equal branches of government.

We would be setting an ominous precedent for future generations to place in Presidential hands sweeping discretionary powers that should rightly be exercised by the Senate and the House.

As the directly elected representatives of the people of our various States, it is we who must move to protect their interests in this current crisis. We cannot look downtown for direction. The initiative and the responsibility are ours.

Mr. President, at one point in the show "My Fair Lady," Eliza Doolittle cries out in anger at "words, words, words."

It is my hope that the American public will not have to rise up in anger and

shout for action instead of words from the Congress.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the majority leader unfortunately cannot be present in the Chamber at this time, but I propose, with his approval, the approval of the minority leader, the minority whip, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the following:

I ask unanimous consent that commencing at 1:30 p.m. the Lausche amendment be called up; that 1 hour be allotted to its consideration, 30 minutes to be allotted to each side, the proponents' time to be controlled by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the opponents' time to be controlled by me, as floor manager of the bill; that the vote shall be had at the expiration of 1 hour; and that any quorum calls which may be had in the meanwhile shall not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. GRIENING in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] that there be included in the unanimous-consent request that at the end of 40 minutes—20 minutes used by the opponents and 20 minutes by me—there shall be a live quorum call, leaving 20 minutes to be used after the quorum call is completed.

Mr. CLARK. I have no objection to that, but I do not think it is necessary to write it into the unanimous-consent agreement because we have agreed that the quorum call shall not be charged to either side.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With that statement I am satisfied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, late yesterday afternoon, when only the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and I were on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], with the concurrence and approval of the Senator from Oregon introduced into the RECORD a letter from the Attorney General, which is printed at page 17179 of the RECORD and which I shall read in full. It is addressed to Senator Long, who stated yesterday that it was written at his request. The letter reads:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1966.

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing in response to your inquiry regarding any constitutional or other legal problems involved in S.J. Res. 181 as reported by the Senate Labor Committee yesterday.

While I do not wish to comment on either the need or merits of this legislation I would like to call your attention to Section 2 which delegates the broadest possible authority to the President to order people back to work pending settlement of a labor dispute. No standards are expressed in the resolution by which to guide the President in this extraordinary delegation of power.

Section 5 provides for enforcement through

injunctive relief. In any judicial proceedings a court would have to find that the power had been exercised properly. Thus the absence of express standards would invite attack in such proceedings. The unnecessarily broad nature of the delegation is underscored by the fact that Congress would already have made the finding expressed in the Railway Labor Act without stating what further findings, if any, the President should make before exercising his discretion.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General.

Mr. President, I wish to point out with regard to the Attorney General's letter that there is either a typographical error or the Attorney General was reading the wrong resolution before he wrote the letter to the Senator from Louisiana, because he refers to "S.J. Res. 181" which is not the pending measure or the committee resolution. The committee resolution is Senate Joint Resolution 186.

Senate Joint Resolution 186 does contain the finding of the Congress in accordance with the criteria of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, that this labor dispute "threatens substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation services."

That finding having been made by the Congress in section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 186, the President is then given discretion as to whether or not to order the men back to work.

As I stated on the floor yesterday, as many other Senator have stated, and as is abundantly clear in the committee report, this resolution uses not only the criteria of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, but follows exactly the procedure set forth in the Railway Labor Act, with respect to the exercise of discretion by the President.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to yield in a few moments.

Under the Railway Labor Act, section 10, it is the National Mediation Board which makes the finding that the dispute threatens substantially to interrupt interstate commerce. That finding having been made, the President decides whether or not to create a dispute board.

I wish to quote from the provisions of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act:

SEC. 10. If a dispute between a carrier and its employees be not adjusted under the foregoing provisions of this Act and should, in the judgment of the Mediation Board, threaten substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation service, the Mediation Board shall notify the President, who may thereupon—

Mr. President, I call attention to the words—"who may thereupon"—in his discretion, create a board to investigate and report respecting such dispute.

Note the words "in his discretion"—Such board shall be composed of such number of persons as to the President may seem desirable: *Provided, however, That no member appointed shall be peculiarly or otherwise interested in any organization of employees or any carrier.* The compensation of

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 3, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The Lord is my helper, and I will not fear what man shall do unto me.
Hebrews 13: 6.

Eternal God, our Father, in whom we live and move and have our being, we are children of Thine—creatures of Thy hands, sustained by Thy spirit, redeemed by Thy love and guided by Thy wisdom. Steady us, we pray Thee, and give us strength to do what we ought to do. Save us from accepting too easy answers to the problems that confront us. Save us from yielding to the temptation to accept the second best when the best can be ours. By the power of an inner spiritual triumph may we conquer all pettiness, all narrowness, and all unworthy desires. May we put first that which is first, second that which is second, and last that which is last. May Thy spirit rule our hearts, and together may we serve our Nation to the limit of our faith and our ability, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 18298. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam in order to authorize the legislature thereof to provide by law for the election of its members from election districts.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3080. An act to amend section 8 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to increase the special revenue bond borrowing authority, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the vice president, pursuant to Public Law 170, 74th Congress, appointed Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. HART, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. FONG, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. SIMPSON (alternate) to be delegates on the part of the Senate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference to be held in Teheran, Iran, September 27 to October 4, 1966.

17304

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF HEARINGS ON SUPPLEMENTAL FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR VIETNAM

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (S. Con. Res. 77) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on supplemental foreign assistance for Vietnam for fiscal 1966, with House amendments thereto, and insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HAYS, JONES of Missouri, and CORBETT.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) to authorize printing of additional copies of hearings, with a House amendment thereto, and insist on the House amendment and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HAYS, JONES of Missouri, and CORBETT.

AUTHORIZING THE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES TO ACCEPT TITLE TO THE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY LIBRARY

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H.J. Res. 1207) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to accept title to the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe the gentleman from Texas would assist the Members of the House if he would explain the precedents that are involved, and the purpose of this proposed legislation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I shall be very pleased to answer the query of our distinguished minority leader and say that this is in accordance with the General Services Administration responsibilities to administer Presidential libraries as a part of the National Archives.

Mr. Speaker, this would implement the immediate acceptance of the very kind and generous offer by the late President's estate of his papers, documents, and other materials of his office, which will be placed in the library. The library will be built by the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, Inc., and then given to the U.S. Government for operation under the Archives system, as a place of research for the people of the United States. This follows the pattern set in the other Presidential libraries—the Hoover Library, the Truman Library, the Roosevelt Library, the Eisenhower Library, and the Johnson Library.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand it, the land and the building are being donated to the Federal Government?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And that through the transfer of title from the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, Inc., to the Federal Government, there is no cost involved to the Federal Government?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. However, as I further understand the matter, once the transfer is consummated, then the Federal Government does have in this case, as it has in the others, the maintenance responsibilities for the future?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. The actual maintenance and operation of Government libraries and museums is estimated to be in the neighborhood of \$225,000 a year.

The estimate for the expenses of the Johnson Library is \$190,000 to \$225,000. The actual expenses of the Truman Library at present are \$230,000; of the Hoover Library, are \$150,000; of the Roosevelt Library are \$210,000; and of the Eisenhower Library are \$175,000.

So, Mr. Speaker, the range is from about \$150,000 to \$230,000 for maintenance and operation, which would be the responsibility of the Government, as we make these materials available to the American people.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I shall not oppose the consideration of this joint resolution, but

August 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17303

RECESS UNTIL 10:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 10:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the Senate recessed, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, August 4, 1966, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 3, 1966:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers, of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consular officers of the United States of America:

A. John Cope, Jr., of Washington.

Grant G. Hilliker, of Virginia.

Now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consular officer of the United States of America:

Clarence J. McIntosh, of Florida.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consular officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Ralph W. Stephan, Jr., of Ohio.

Now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consular officer of the United States of America:

Fernando E. Rondon, of California.

For promotion from a Foreign Service officer of class 7 to class 6:

John D. Foiger, of the District of Columbia.

For promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 7 to class 6 and to be also consular officers of the United States of America:

Edward P. Allen, of Massachusetts.

Samuel B. Bartlett, of Massachusetts.

Don E. Bean, of Virginia.

Lee S. Bigelow, of Texas.

Henry Clay Black II, of Illinois.

Marion V. Creekmore, Jr., of Tennessee.

Hilary J. Cunningham, of Michigan.

Edmund T. DeJarnette, Jr., of Virginia.

Frank Ralph Golino, of Pennsylvania.

William H. Gussman, of New York.

Richard J. Harrington, of California.

Edwin Ho, of California.

Leon M. Johnson, Jr., of Colorado.

D. Lowell Jones, of Mississippi.

Norman C. LaBrie, of Massachusetts.

Denis Lamb, of New York.

James W. Lamont, of Maryland.

John R. Lampe, of Minnesota.

George H. Lane, of Illinois.

Mark Lore, of New Jersey.

Michael J. Mercurio, of Ohio.

Geoffrey Ogden, of California.

Donald K. Parsons, of California.

Harry W. Quillian, of Virginia.

Alan D. Romberg, of New York.

Charles B. Salmon, Jr., of New York.

Donald E. J. Stewart, of the District of Columbia.

Peter O. Suchman, of New York.

Walter Frederick Weiss, of California.

David S. Wilson, of California.

For promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 8 to class 7 and to be also consular officers of the United States of America:

Edward James Alexander, of Colorado.

David E. Brown, of Pennsylvania.

G. Gardiner Brown, of Ohio.

Donald E. Crafts, of Georgia.

Gordon J. DuGan, of the District of Columbia.

John J. Hurley, Jr., of Massachusetts.

Walter J. Kearns, of Montana.

Frank P. Kelly, of New Jersey.

John H. Kelly, of Virginia.

Stuart H. Lippe, of Michigan.

Thomas E. Macklin, Jr., of California.
Thomas J. O'Flaherty, of New York.
Miss Eleanor Wallace Savage, of California.
Miss Elizabeth R. Thaurston, of Indiana.
James E. Thyden, of California.
Miss Judy Anne Uhle, of Illinois.
William D. Wade, of Massachusetts.
Anthony H. Wallace, of New York.
Miss Carol A. Westenhöfer, of Michigan.
Paul R. Wisgerhof, of Colorado.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

John H. Adams, of California.
John W. Bligh, Jr., of New York.
Norman H. Buchsbaum, of New York.
Timothy J. Burke, of Wisconsin.
Michael B. Cook, of New York.
Bruce Cossaboom, of New Jersey.
James F. Creagan, of Ohio.
Carl C. Cundiff, of Oklahoma.
John H. Curry, of Michigan.
Lawrence A. Dash, of Pennsylvania.
Edward S. Dubel, of New Jersey.
Bernard Engel, of Ohio.
Albert E. Fairchild, of North Carolina.
Daniel Figgins, of Iowa.
Robert M. Fresco, of New York.
Richard J. Higgins, of Missouri.
Dell J. Hood, of Texas.
Duane L. King, of Washington.
James O. Knowles, Jr., of Washington.
Miss Barbara M. Kugel, of Michigan.
Lawrence B. Lesser, of New York.
Philip Thomas Lincoln, Jr., of Michigan.
James B. Magnor, Jr., of New York.
James P. Nach, of New York.
Gene R. Preston, of California.
Jerry Lincoln Prillaman, of Virginia.
Denis R. Regan, of New York.
James L. Robb, of Colorado.
Erik S. Ronhovde, of Montana.
C. Michael Schneider, of Ohio.
James T. Schollaert, of Pennsylvania.
Charles S. Spencer, Jr., of Tennessee.
Thomas E. E. Spooner, of New York.
Willis J. Sutter, of New Jersey.
Miss Caroline Marr Turtle, of Arizona.
Phillip J. Walls, of Michigan.
Stephen H. Whilder, of Virginia.
Howard S. Witmer II, of Michigan.
Kenneth Yalowitz, of Illinois.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Miss Juliet C. Antunes, of New York.
William S. Butcher, of Ohio.
Robert K. Carr, of California.
Robert J. Carroll, of Connecticut.
Thomas H. Carter, of Florida.
Herbert A. Cochran, of North Carolina.
Preston M. Corn, of Illinois.
James P. Dodd, of Kentucky.
David J. Dunford, of California.
Miss Katherine M. Durkin, of New York.
Robert C. Felder, of New York.
Thomas Austin Forbord, of California.
William L. Gallagher, of California.
Miss Patricia J. Howell, of Indiana.
Robert D. Johnson, of Missouri.
Philip A. King, of Florida.
Miss Isabel D. Lamy, of Missouri.
Edward Gibson Lanpher, of Virginia.
Alexander O. Lehner, of New Jersey.
James N. May, of North Carolina.
Norman D. McLennan, of Michigan.
Jonathan C. Menes, of California.
Ralph R. Mooney, of Virginia.
Robert J. Palmeri, of Massachusetts.
Raymond J. Pardon, of New York.
David D. Passage, of Colorado.
Robert Stephen Pastorino, of California.
Gerald D. Ramsey, of the District of Columbia.
Arnold L. Raphael, of New York.
James J. Reid, of Texas.
Lange Schermerhorn, of New Jersey.
Edric Sherman, of California.
Thomas H. Shugart, Jr., of North Carolina.
Steven E. Steiner, of Pennsylvania.
Byron R. Stephenson, of Kansas.

Miss Carol K. Stocker, of Illinois.
Terrence P. Tiffany, of Oregon.
Kenneth H. Torp, of New York.
Miss Ruth L. Willow, of Michigan.
Ralph Winstanley II, of Indiana.

A Foreign Service Reserve officer to be a consular officer of the United States of America:

Thomas A. Twetten, of Iowa.
Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consular officers and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

James D. Baldwin, of New Jersey.
Edmund F. Becker, of Virginia.
Edward B. Beidleman, of Virginia.
Paul H. Brent, of California.
Mrs. Ruth L. Brooks, of Michigan.
Eugen F. Burgstaller, of Maryland.
Stewart D. Burton, of Utah.
Will J. Carter, of Texas.
R. Dabney Chapman, of Maryland.
Gordon A. Martin, of Maryland.
Robert N. Chipperfield, of Illinois.
John D. Clayton, of Virginia.
Walter R. Cox, of Texas.
Robert E. Day, Jr., of Virginia.
Eddie Deerfield, of Illinois.
Cloyce I. Dixon, Jr., of Maryland.
Richard L. Doerschuk, of Maryland.
William W. Douglass, of Kentucky.
James H. Feldman, of Ohio.
Alan Fisher, of the District of Columbia.
James M. Flint, of Maryland.
C. M. Fry, of Missouri.
Allen Fuehrer, of Virginia.
Burton L. Gerber, of Missouri.
Robert S. Hewett, of Virginia.
Neil Hinckley, of Utah.
Paul W. Hodges, of Virginia.
John T. Kirby, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph Yoshiro Kiyonaga, of Maryland.
John F. Kordke, of Illinois.
Arthur R. Lee, of Idaho.
George H. McLain, of Virginia.
Samuel Duncan Miller, of the District of Columbia.
John S. Morgan, of Florida.
Peter Cary Muncie, of Maryland.
Edmund R. Murphy, of California.
Miss Kathleen O'Malley, of the District of Columbia.
Herschel F. Peak, of California.
John P. Presby, of Texas.
Metro Romankiw, of Virginia.
Richard E. Scutt, of Pennsylvania.
George Sekel, Jr., of Ohio.
Glenn Lee Smith, of California.
Jerome J. Stenger, Jr., of Maryland.
John McH. Stuart, of New York.
John M. Taylor, of Virginia.
Robert Allen Thomas, of Pennsylvania.
Joel D. Ticknor, of California.
Eugene W. Trone, of Pennsylvania.
Donald C. Weaver, of Virginia.
Joseph C. Wheeler, of Pennsylvania.
Robert E. Winter, of Ohio.
Foreign Service staff officers to be consular officers of the United States of America:

Donald J. Bouchard, of Maine.
Richard A. Calfee, of Michigan.
Allen Cooper, of Florida.
Henry P. Daymont, of California.
Lloyd M. Duffe, of Iowa.
Charles E. Gates, of California.
Miss Mildred J. Hall, of West Virginia.
George M. Hiraga, of California.
Miss Catherine M. Hurley, of Connecticut.
Miss Lucy H. Little, of Florida.
Robert A. MacCallum, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph P. Malone, of Massachusetts.
Joseph L. Martinez, of Pennsylvania.
F. Coleman Parrott, of Alabama.
George J. Peterson, of California.
Chester F. Polley, Jr., of Illinois.
Charles T. Pooley, of New York.
David A. Roberts, of Pennsylvania.
George F. Rodman, of North Carolina.
Danny B. Root, of California.
Miss Mary J. Singhouse, of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Dorothy M. Weaver, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Frances Lee Weinman, of Washington.

August 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A TIME OF SADNESS, A TIME FOR HOPE

(By David Gimbel)

I remember, my little girl, when you were only two,
The world all around you seemed so bright and new.
Your smile would brighten every room with eternal, previous light,
And my happiness would reign supreme when you were in my sight.

I remember when we went outside, the snow was on the ground,
And like costly jewels, flakes kissed your face but you never made a sound.
Then came the Spring with birds on trees, and sweetness filled the air,
But when neighbors passed you by, they would always stop and stare.

By the time you reached the age of three my concern began to grow,
I began to travel from place to place, for I really had to know.
The truth just hit me with such force, my dreams were all in vain,
And I found myself like in a trance, just walking in the rain.

Like parents of past centuries I keep on asking "Why?";
The question is as old as time, so I bear my pain and cry.
But the parents of retarded children with their unlimited courage and devotion, Are all born with a feeling of love that is deeper than any ocean.

But the years slipped by and like a flower you blossomed with beauty rare,
And now when folks would make remarks I'd never listen or care.
For Right is Might, 'tis also they world in they own limited way.
Now Hope eternal is my song, "Dear God", I'll always pray.

Oh, I'll help to build a citadel to erase those ugly years,
So that we can bring in sunshine where there were only tears.
From a past of endless sorrow and a system too difficult to cope,
We'll look forward to a future filled with Progress, Love and Hope.

Vietnam Statements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following editorial from the August 1, 1966, issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

SAYING WHAT IS EXPECTED

We seem to have a standing habit in the country of paying great respect and examining the great details pronouncements that are actually meaningless on their faces.

It is a long standing practice.

After all, we dropped the atomic bomb because we believed the repeated Japanese statements that they would defend their "sacred soil" and happily die before giving up—taking millions of American lives with them. Actually, while such statements were being made and feverish preparations for a "suicidal" defense being made, the maneuvers to seek a surrender had already been decided upon. The loud threats and boasts were attempts to get a better offer and a negotiating position.

But we are slow learners.

We got in a big flap when the Buddhists threatened to resist by their own civil war with the Ky regime and fight to the death any effort to discipline them or restrain them. They said at the main pagoda in Hue, specifically, that any attempt of government troops to enter would be met by a wall of burning monks, a fight to the death, and the blowing up of the whole shebang.

Yes, we got in a big flap, but Ky didn't. His troops moved in. The pyres in front of the pagoda went unlit, the interior unblown, and the defenders surrendered without a shot. The supposed "civil war" petered out into the burning of a couple of hysterical teen-agers and a couple of street demonstrations, poorly attended.

How many times has this game been played? What would you expect an enemy to say when he's trying to get YOU to back down: 'Really, we'll quit if pressed.' ?/?/?

Now, North Viet Nam shrieks that they'll fight for another 20 years if necessary, and Americans wring their hands and want to either pulverize Hanoi or "get out of Viet Nam"!

What in the world do we expect Ho to say? He says what he HAS to say to try to get his way—and anybody that speaks up and says, "No, we won't! Are you nuts?" will get shot.

(Only here can the efforts of the government to be impressive in our determination—for the same reason and purpose—do a bunch of folks eagerly jump to their feet—or the nearest microphone—to holler: "Don't you believe it!")

Politics domestic or international offers a host of situations in which the public utterances are predictable, virtually inevitable, regardless of the truth.

When that occurs we certainly ought to recognize such statements as meaningless one way or the other, instead of taking them so seriously.

McNamara's 1963 statement about all Americans being home from Viet Nam in 1965 was such a statement, and we said so at the time. It was merely a means of telling the world we were NOT trying to take over that place—and seeking peace in the event the Communists were fearful of an American presence and otherwise willing to end the fracas.

Yet, it was taken literally then, and is still harked back to as if McNamara was smoking opium or something!

Lyndon Johnson in 1960 said flatly that under no circumstances, whatsoever, would he be a candidate for vice president if Kennedy beat him for the presidential nomination. He HAD to say that or weaken his position in the convention. We said so at the time. The Nation's professional commentators, however, took it and treated it as gospel truth.

Now, we are going through the same sort of game with Premier Ky in South Viet Nam, taking his statements at face value and then "analyzing" what this means to the international situation.

Everybody seems to have forgotten that promised elections are coming, now, in South Viet Nam, and Premier Ky is deeply involved and concerned with those election results.

He is not candidly discussing war policy with reporters off the top of his head. He is making statements calculated to make his fellow citizens say: "We are going to need Gen. Ky."

And he says what he HAS to say to lead them to that attitude.

It is as simple as that.
As meaningless as the statements made by Lyndon Johnson in the last presidential campaign here about Viet Nam!

Or those made in the election campaign of 1960 by John F. Kennedy about Quemoy and Matsu and a "missile gap."

Or those made by Eisenhower in his first campaign about slashing the budget to fifty billions.

Or those made by Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932 about balancing the budget!

We are slow learners, indeed, on the subject of political statements made to meet obvious political pressures!

It's too much to expect us to change as we face another "silly season" in the election campaigns now getting underway right here.

Urge To Serve in Washington Can Go Too Far

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1966

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial by Hugh Sidey which appeared in the July 29, 1966, issue of Life magazine that reminds us that all things do not revolve around the Federal Government and that men and women with a sense of citizenship are the country's greatest strength. This excellent editorial which appeared in the July 28 issue of Life magazine.

The author, Hugh Sidey, has touched a nerve here, and, hopefully, it should give a twinge to the public servant who has become preoccupied with the belief that all things revolve around the Federal Government.

Mr. Sidey reminds us that this country's strength and greatness still lies in its millions of men and women who choose others to run the Government while they run their own lives.

This "government of the people, for the people and by the people" has succeeded because it has continued to be aware of the wants of the people.

The article follows:

URGE TO SERVE IN WASHINGTON CAN GO TOO FAR

(By Hugh Sidey)

The men in the higher reaches of the national government sooner or later suffer, in varying degrees, a virulent affliction which inhibits the eye, pinches the brain and obsesses the victim with the belief that the noblest calling of mankind is to work in Washington for the Administration in power. In extreme infections, the love of job supplants wives, children, religion, recreation, the alpha and the omega and anything else that's left. The mediocre pay is hardly a bother. The thrill of deciding the fate of countries and dispatching armies or replanning societies and economics, or simply lurking at the fringes of power, outweighs anything else the world has to offer.

It may be that some men involved in private pursuits are just as dedicated, but perhaps they don't become so convinced of their cause. John Kennedy's press secretary, Pierre Salinger, now an airlines vice president and surrounded with West Coast opulence and esteem, can't quite conceal a hankering to get back where the power lies. It took Douglas Dillon three Presidents and 7 years to tear himself away from the Potomac and go back to his millions in Wall Street—and even then his departure was reluctant. Veteran Diplomat Averell Harri-

August 3, 1966

man, 74, took medium rank in the State Department without flinching just to be around to participate in the big show. Arthur Schlesinger Jr. was frank to admit that he preferred his stay in the capital to tenure at Harvard.

It is strongly suspected that Ted Sorenson, another Kennedy aide, would gladly abandon his New York prominence and high lawyer's pay for the right kind of federal post.

Certainly the dedication of highly talented men is essential to the success of the U.S. But the singular preoccupation with federal office tends to make public servants forget that American greatness still resides overwhelmingly in millions of people in thousands of towns and cities and on farms doing other things than running the government. This preoccupation produces a feeling, expressed in various ways, that to serve the federal government is a kind of higher duty or experience that all of us should somehow share.

Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara made a widely applauded suggestion that all young persons in this country, boys and girls, perhaps should be required—whether in peace or war—to give a year or two of their lives in some kind of national service. But the proposal, made in sincerity (and because the draft is now such an onerous problem), slighted a great many people who aren't in the government and don't want to be unless there is a national emergency.

There are a lot of folks around who think that it is just as vital for a young Los Angeles woman to get married and rear a family with respect for law and the rights of men as it is for another young woman to work in the poverty program. There are some who contend that a young teacher in Orient, Iowa who opens the world to his class is just as dedicated to the flag as a Peace Corps volunteer in Chile. The young engineers who develop the techniques of our industry are as important to the strength of this country as the special assistants who inhabit the big federal agencies.

There are weeks in this city, in fact, when, after a plethora of conferences and meetings such as the recent one on the status of women, the residents would gladly barter half a dozen status officials for one mother who wants more than anything to bring love and beauty into the lives of her children. Or they would trade a whole physical fitness conference in Washington for one grandfather who would round up the neighborhood children and take them on a hike.

Oddly enough, the idea of some sort of universal national service seemed to have been swallowed with the rest of the soft soap out of Washington. George Gallup's poll found that 72% of those surveyed thought the plan had merit. Nor was there much protest from those traditional defenders of individuality and the right of self-determination, the Republicans. It was Harvard's President Nathan Pusey who spoke up against the McNamara idea. It was, he declared, "coercive conformity." And, he added for good measure, "I cannot believe our government could possibly provide a demanding and meaningful experience without the help of the colleges, for the millions of young people—men and women—who would be involved. . . . Nor can I think of anything worse for young people eager to get on in the world than to stand by marking time."

Another quite important man has his doubts. Speaking to a group of teen-agers, who have a special and immediate interest in the matter, Lyndon Johnson said pointedly: "The new age will also require much of those who do not enter public service—the housewives, the businessmen." He went on to explain: "If we are to solve our problems, our citizens must develop a new sense of citizenship, a new concern for the public good."

The President talks of putting responsibility on the people back home in connection with his concept of creative federalism. In a week where headlines tell of one of the worst mass murders in this country's history, where riots flare from Cleveland to Jacksonville, there is not much doubt that some of the biggest challenges this country faces are in the town halls, corporation offices and the homes.

Clearly, this kind of "black power" is blackmail, and it will have to be dealt with as such, regardless of race or color. Majorities, too, have rights to be defended.

Truth in Packaging Bill Has False Label

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1966

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, in my view the pending Federal packaging and labeling bill carries a false label when it is referred to as "truth-in-packaging." I submit that we would do well to take a careful look at this legislative package—to examine its contents as well as its label—before buying it and passing it on to encumber the national economy and the American consumer at this time.

In my opinion this proposed legislation is legally superfluous, technically inexact and an inflationary time bomb for the American food and grocery consumer.

I was pleased, therefore, to note in this morning's Washington Post the article by the distinguished journalist Mr. Roscoe Drummond, entitled "Buyer Beware: Deceptive Packaging Bill."

Earlier this week I noted with pleasure another fine article on this subject by Alyce Hazeltine, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer's "Prudence Penny."

At the conclusion of my brief remarks I shall include both articles and commend them to the attention of my colleagues. The points made by the authors of these articles are well taken.

What concerns me most of all about this Federal packaging and labeling bill, Mr. Speaker, is that while it offers little new protection to the American consumer, it would hike the escalating cost of food and groceries. Evidence in Committee points out that American food processors would have to spend millions of dollars in converting equipment to meet requirements of the proposed bill. And, Mr. Speaker, experience shows that increased food processing costs mean higher prices on our supermarket shelves.

As the articles to follow point out, what is unfortunate about this situation is that the so-called truth-in-packaging bill actually gives consumers few legal safeguards they do not already have.

It is fortunate, indeed, that at long last the American consumer is being made aware of the false label concealing the contents of this proposed legislation. In my view, consumers need higher food costs right now like they need square wheels on their supermarket shopping carts.

As a Member of Congress, as a consumer, as a housewife, I urge the Congress and the American public to give careful study to the inflationary effects of this bill before final action is taken. [From the Washington Post, Aug. 3, 1966]

BUYER BEWARE: DECEPTIVE PACKAGING BILL
(By Roscoe Drummond)

This "truth in packaging" bill, now before Congress, is just about the most decep-

August 3, 1966

Seeing no better solution, I suggest the addition of this tool to present labor-management relations law.

I propose that compulsory arbitration machinery be set in operation when the President or, and I repeat "or," the Congress makes the determination that a strike has become a national emergency or an intolerable public nuisance. No more deferring of the Congress or the President to the other; no more fiddling; no more "dilly dallying" or charging one another of failure to act. Secondly, I propose the representation of the public on the Board of Arbitration. I suggest a three-member Board with full authority to settle all issues. One representative selected by labor, one by management and one member of the American Arbitration Association or the American Bar Association to represent the public, user, and taxpayer interests. All other procedures of the present law could be retained.

These new but simple suggestions would insure more nearly fair settlements without the enormous losses, hardships and inconveniences of discontinued service.

My plan, when known and understood by the parties, would encourage, if not impel, quicker settlements of labor disputes. It would insure more stability and productivity in public transportation industries.

I believe scholars and students of labor-management relations know what is necessary. We do not need a study commission. We do not need protracted hearings in both the House and Senate. We need courage. We need to eliminate politics. We need to consider the public. We need new enabling legislation. We need it now.

These proposals are intended to, and do, protect the basic right of labor to organize, bargain, and strike. They also protect the necessary right of investors to earn a profit, and of management to manage its business.

Reckless, irresponsible, callous, or greedy action by either party must be minimized. The public rights must have primacy and must be protected now and in the future.

I urge members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to consider my proposals which are included in my bill.

Statement on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1966

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, July 29, 46 Members of the House of Representatives sponsored a statement on Vietnam in response to the recent pronouncement by Premier Ky suggesting an invasion of North Vietnam and eventual war with Red China. As one of the signatory Members, I would like

to introduce this statement in the Record as I believe it will be of great interest to my colleagues:

STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

Recent statements by Premier Ky suggesting an invasion of North Vietnam, and eventual war with Red China, indicate he and other South Vietnamese generals have ambitions that extend far beyond and contradict the limited aims stated by President Johnson in seeking self-determination for the Vietnamese people. The danger that the war will spread is increasing daily. Extension of the conflict may embroil the major powers of the world in a destructive and brutal confrontation that would shatter all hopes of world peace.

Premier Ky's statements dramatize the necessity for the American government to redirect its energies more forcefully in pursuit of a peaceful political settlement of the war. The spiral of escalation now being advocated by General Ky must be opposed and new initiatives attempted for negotiated settlement. The United States should use its great influence to assure that fair and free elections open to all parties will be held in the South so that a truly representative civilian government may be established. The granting of political rights to all would offer a peaceful alternative to those who now pursue the path of armed rebellion.

DEMOCRATS

JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, JOHN A. BLATNIK, JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., PHILLIP BURTON, RONALD BROOKS CAMERON, JEFFERY COHELAN, JOHN CONYERS, JR., JOHN DOW, KEN W. DYAL, DON EDWARDS, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, DONALD FRASER, JACOB H. GILBERT, BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, KEN HECHLER, HENRY HELSTOSKI, ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, ROBERT LEGGETT, JOHN C. MACKIE, SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, RICHARD D. McCARTHY, PATSY T. MINK, WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, ROBERT N. C. NIX, BARRATT O'HARA, EDWARD J. PATTEN, THOMAS REES, JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, HENRY S. REUSS, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, EDWARD ROYBAL, WILLIAM F. RYAN, JAMES H. SCHEUER, JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER, WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, HERBERT TENZER, LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, WESTON VIVIAN, JEROME R. WALDIE, LESTER WOLFF, SIDNEY R. YATES.

REPUBLICANS

SEYMOUR HALPERN, THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN.

A Mother Does Her Bit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

MR. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the morale of our men in our Armed Forces overseas is vitally important, not only to their own well-being, but to their performance of duty. As every soldier and sailor knows, such morale is lifted immeasurably by the arrival of parcels and mail from home.

One mother who realizes this and who is doing more than her share to boost the morale not only of her own son but of all members of his outfit is Mrs. Leonard Sellers of my own district in

California. Mr. Lee Chilson, who writes a column in the Chula Vista Star-News, took note of this in the issue of July 14.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this heart-warming newspaper account of the activities of Mrs. Sellers in sending to the troops overseas such typically American products as hamburgers, and the joyous welcome with which her packages are received by men fighting in Vietnam:

A MOTHER DOES HER BIT

"It's hard to put down on paper how happy I and the rest of the guys were the day the Goodie box came. It brought us all a little closer to home—even if for only a few minutes." . . . "Your son Paul is lucky to have such a wonderful family. The goodie box was just great. Thank you so much." . . . "The box was wonderful. It brought back memories of home. It gets lonely over here."

Those were just a few of the quotes from letters received this week by Mrs. Leonard Sellers, 1058 Monserate Ave., Chula Vista. They came from her son and a dozen or so of his Marine pals fighting the war in far-off Viet Nam. The "goodie boxes" that brought on all the thanks were mailed several weeks ago by Mr. and Mrs. Sellers. They weren't the usual boxes of candy and cookies, though. They were filled with real American hamburgers.

We told you about Mrs. Sellers and her efforts to get the 'burgers all the way to Viet Nam several weeks ago. She packed cans of beef patties and wrapped buns in special material so they would stay fresh on the long trip. This week she received pictures and letters of thanks. She let us read them, including this one from her son:

"The box that I remember (and always will) was the box of hamburgers, and there's a little story I'd like to tell you about how we finally got a chance to eat them. Sunday at about 11 a.m. we got the word to pack up our gear because we were moving out. We got on trucks and they took us to our base in Chu-Lai. We made up field transport packs and went to the airstrip.

"While we were waiting to board the plane we had mail call. I got some letters and a couple of boxes. We opened the smaller box and ate the cookies but I knew what was in the big package. I was so loaded down with gear that carrying the box was a little difficult so a couple of the guys carried my pack and gear.

"Believe me, we really guarded that box. We handled it like it was glass. Finally we boarded our plane and flew to DaNang. We got on trucks again and they took us south to a camp. When we got to the camp it was almost dark. Most of us hadn't eaten all day.

"We opened the box. (I took some pictures and it was just about dark so I hope they came out.) I guess I don't have to tell you how fast the hamburgers disappeared. They were delicious. And you should have seen some of the other Marines coming by when they saw our gang eating real hamburgers. They couldn't believe their eyes!"

Terry Fountain, another Chula Vista youth who joined the Marine Corps with Sellers, also wrote Mr. and Mrs. Sellers about the 'burgers. "They were great. Everyone enjoyed them. Only thing missing were some pretty girls to serve them," he wrote.

And Don Schneider, the Navy corpsman with Sellers' unit, had this to say about the 'burgers he received: "They were just great. We heated them on a little stove and they brought back a lot of memories. It gets lonely out here." Schneider, who everyone calls "Doc," has been in the Navy 4½ years and is the father of a five-month-old son.

Tom Tobin of LaPuente, Calif., was on duty during the DaNang riots when his box of 'burgers came. He wrote Mrs. Sellers,

August 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4103

Country	Original debt (principal and interest)	Payments (princi- pal and interest)	Total still owed (in- cluding interest)
Great Britain	\$4,802,181,641.56	\$2,024,854,297.74	\$9,453,659,301.93
France	4,089,680,588.18	486,075,891.00	6,580,932,495.81
Italy	2,042,364,319.28	100,829,880.16	2,251,483,409.34
Belgium	419,837,630.37	52,191,273.24	669,899,077.60
Russia	192,601,297.37	8,750,311.88	640,080,535.28
Poland	207,344,297.37	22,646,297.55	449,810,224.20
Czechoslovakia	185,071,023.07	20,134,002.26	266,822,052.34
Romania	63,359,192.45	4,791,007.22	111,199,610.69
Yugoslavia	63,577,712.55	2,588,771.69	82,500,468.46
Greece	32,499,922.67	4,127,056.01	45,590,335.10
Armenia	11,059,917.49		39,350,996.73
Estonia	16,466,012.87	1,248,432.07	35,942,300.81
Austria	26,843,148.66	862,668.00	26,024,535.59
Latvia	6,888,664.20	761,549.07	14,899,340.09
Lithuania	6,432,465.00	1,237,966.58	13,375,487.90
Finland	8,999,999.97	15,063,230.93	5,071,000.00
Hungary	1,982,555.50	556,919.76	4,068,341.20
Cuba	10,000,000.00	12,286,781.68	
Nicaragua	141,950.36	108,575.84	
Liberia	26,000.00	36,471.56	

Here is a country-by-country breakdown of World War II and post-war debt as of last Dec. 31, the most recent date for which complete figures are available. Figures for

individual countries may not add to the total borrowed because of currency and other adjustments made over the years.

Country	Total borrowed	Principal repaid	Principal still owed
United Kingdom	\$5,468,858,528	\$1,486,525,955	\$3,982,336,440
India	3,428,088,387	281,140,246	3,108,328,435
Brazil	1,949,049,147	737,804,361	1,070,285,345
Pakistan	1,078,689,613	88,003,864	1,030,312,912
Japan	1,614,277,759	850,676,674	763,601,085
Turkey	762,815,984	78,378,074	683,614,786
Yugoslavia	725,159,418	83,542,799	613,889,951
Chile	782,644,959	205,896,225	566,403,925
United Arab Republic	595,715,780	35,922,379	555,560,549
Israel	614,091,098	182,961,688	419,761,297
Spain	538,718,873	126,228,166	412,434,841
France	2,534,908,591	2,127,189,907	404,381,837
China (Formosa)	572,213,463	213,602,287	358,486,732
Argentina	594,701,907	231,615,040	349,044,903
Colombia	526,934,290	226,445,046	278,583,031
Mexico	712,860,739	456,417,646	253,208,119
Morocco	272,470,364	19,935,061	251,501,346
Iran	354,346,406	105,042,800	249,561,331
Germany	1,350,372,601	1,131,093,239	225,019,752
Russia	222,494,574	32,485,673	190,008,901
Greece	288,005,952	107,155,114	179,376,895
Indonesia	309,100,456	123,453,331	170,221,047
Peru	326,233,485	179,357,806	146,867,634
Italy	722,279,227	577,268,429	145,006,950
Ireland	128,200,000	16,403,932	111,796,068
Portugal	134,425,231	22,474,904	111,069,679
Philippines	285,237,495	180,302,707	104,539,387
Liberia	120,756,533	19,090,525	102,363,408
Tunisia	94,102,956	5,257,988	86,427,258
Poland	142,231,610	69,863,558	82,376,934
Others	3,990,515,337	2,130,968,143	1,847,819,541

Proposal for Minimizing the Public Hardship in Transportation Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1966

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it must be clear to those involved—the machinists, the airline operators, the public, and the Government—that a protracted strike of five major airlines, or the discontinuance of air transportation service, is no longer tolerable.

Regardless of the efficacy, even need, of the strike device in ordinary labor-management disputes, it is no longer an appropriate weapon in labor disputes when public hardship or a national emergency is involved.

The public has a majority interest in the transportation business. Transportation—air, water, land, or rail—is a

service, a public service, whether passenger, mail, or freight.

The taxpayer has a large stake in all transportation businesses.

Profits are essential to the airlines and important to the public. The wages should be fair for the work done. The profits should be fair for the risk, investment, and service rendered. Neither excessive wages nor excessive profits should be taken at the expense of the user of the transportation or at the expense of the taxpayer who contributes to the subsidies and governmental services to the industry.

Any excessive profits or wages which are not returned to the public in reduced fares are just as inflationary and unacceptable as increased prices that are required by excessive wage or profit demands. The fare-paying traveler is just as entitled to a slice of the extra profits as are the employers and employees. The taxpayer is just as much entitled to a slice of the extraordinary profits as they were obligated to subsidize when profits were impossible.

In many places public transportation is an absolute necessity. Interruptions of transportation can quickly and easily become a public inconvenience or hardship or a national emergency.

Presently it must be clear that a political solution is usually wrong or often impossible. It would appear as though President Johnson has refused to intervene in either the airline or the New York City transport strikes for political reasons. Politics has no place in labor disputes when the national interest or public inconvenience is involved.

President Johnson is quick to use his office to control steel, aluminum, and other industries, but laggardly when unions exceed the administration economic guidelines allegedly designed to forestall inflation. Perhaps another President would be similarly encumbered and shackled by the feared political consequences.

Through press-agency, President Johnson attempted to milk as much political advantage as possible out of the negotiation proceedings. His curious outward detachment from the negotiations until settlement appeared imminent, then the nighttime summons of the parties to the White House woodshed, the mandatory closeting of the negotiators in the Executive offices, the grand TV announcement of the "noninflationary" settlement, the devious childish withholding of the terms of the agreement from the public, the taxpaying, and the families of the machinists until the time of the election must have demonstrated that this President and his labor advisers do not understand labor, do not care about management, and have little concern for the public or the taxpayer. Neither crass politics nor cheap press-agency have any legitimate or helpful place in labor-management. The President has mishandled the airline strike.

The President cannot be blamed entirely because there is no prescribed plan or procedure for solution.

A new procedure for settling strikes of this nature is desperately needed to resume air transportation service now and to preclude such a public inconvenience and hardship in the future.

The present law permits Congress and the President to weasel out of their responsibility. Congress leaves the problem to the President; the President defers to the Congress. Generally, President Johnson likes to intrude on the prerogatives of the legislature—but not in distasteful strike situations. Congress must enact clear enabling legislation.

Compulsory arbitration is a distasteful method for settling an ordinary labor-management dispute. Compulsory arbitration brings together representatives of both contending parties with a neutral third party acceptable to both contenders. While compulsion in any form in a free society is objectionable, the inhumanitarian hardships of unabated use of economic power by either labor or management are also objectionable. Heretofore, Congress has refused to invoke compulsory arbitration for many good reasons. The enormity of the public detriment now overwhelms the reasons against compulsory arbitration.